

INDIANA CRIMINAL JUSTICE INSTITUTE CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY

INTERPRETING THE RESULTS

In response to a request from the Governor's office and ICJI Executive Director Heather Bolejack, the Research Division of ICJI was tasked with creating and implementing a Customer Satisfaction Survey to measure subgrantee attitudes and feelings towards ICJI. The Research Division created the initial survey instrument, which was then circulated throughout the divisions and executive staff for review. Once the survey was finalized the Research Division worked with the Victims Division, Youth Division, Traffic Safety Division, and Drug & Crime Control Division of ICJI to disseminate the survey to all of their respective subgrantees or "customers" either through the mail or email.

A total of 810 surveys were sent out from ICJI and 245 were returned for a response rate of 30%. There is disagreement about what constitutes an adequate response rate. Adequate is a judgment call that depends on the population, practical limitations, the topic, and the response with which specific researchers feel comfortable. Most researchers, however, consider anything below 50% to be a poor response rate and not necessarily indicative of the target population. Common response rates for mail surveys, however, are generally between 10 and 50%. The respective Division response rates were as follows: 1) Victims Division had 44/200 surveys returned for a response rate of 22%; 2) Youth Division had 81/300 surveys returned for a response rate of 27%; 3) Traffic Safety Division had 54/250 surveys returned for a response rate of 22%; and 4) Drug & Crime Control Division had 42/60 surveys returned for a response rate of 70%.

Each survey response was coded with a corresponding numerical value indicating the respondent's view of ICJI process and administration. Questions three through thirteen were coded using a Likert Scale with respondent's indicating their degree of agreement with each statement, i.e., Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. Responses of Strongly Agree were coded with a 1, Agree = 2, Undecided = 3, Disagree = 4, and Strongly Disagree = 5. Therefore, in determining the performance of each division for each respective survey question, the closer to 1, the better the performance; the higher the average response, the less favorable towards ICJI.

Question one merely indicates which division the respondent noted working most frequently with and question two assessed the nature of the sub-grantee's general contact with that division.

DIVISION RESULTS

Victims Division

The general nature of sub-grantee contact with the Victims Division was in regards to either Technical Assistance or Grant Application Information.

Areas of Achievement: The Victims Division scored well in their courteousness and helpfulness to sub-grantees, the timeliness of their responses to requests for information, and their courteousness and understanding toward sub-grantee problems.

Areas of Improvement: The Victims Division understandability of the grant administration process scored the most unfavorably of all ICJI divisions. The division also scored poorly in the efficiency of the grant administration process and the notification process for awards and denials.

Narratives: The majority of narrative complaints were in regards to lost paperwork, the timeliness of the grant notification process, and personnel changes. Communication and correspondence between sub-grantees and division personnel was a highlight, as well as the grant training seminars and the friendliness and effort of the staff.

Youth Division

The general nature of sub-grantee contact with the Youth Division was in regards to Grant Application Information.

Areas of Achievement: The Youth Division scored well in their courteousness and helpfulness to sub-grantees, the accuracy of information provided, and their courteousness and understanding toward sub-grantee problems.

Areas of Improvement: The Youth Division scored a bit less favorably in the efficiency and notification of the grant administration process, as well as in the communication and correspondence with sub-grantees.

Narratives: Complaints from sub-grantees were generally solely centered on the lack of communication coming from the Youth Division, i.e., not returning phone calls and emails, not receiving requests for information, and not being made aware of changes in program requirements. Highlights of the Youth Division narratives focused on staff effort and courteousness.

Drug & Crime Control

The general nature of sub-grantee contact with the Drug & Crime Control Division was in regards to Technical Assistance and Grant Application Information.

Areas of Achievement: The Drug & Crime Control Division scored well in the courteousness and helpfulness of staff, the accuracy of information provided, and the timeliness with which information requests are processed.

Areas of Improvement: The only area the Drug & Crime Control Division scored a bit less favorably in was the efficiency of the grant administration process.

Narratives: Very few complaints were recorded for the Drug & Crime Control Division overall, although there were complaints regarding staff changes and reporting requirements. The majority of sub-grantees have had a positive experience with the Drug & Crime Control Division, especially regarding the helpfulness and knowledge of the staff.

Traffic Safety

The general nature of sub-grantee contact with the Traffic Safety Division was in regards to Grant Application Information. The Traffic Safety Division scored the most favorably overall out of all the divisions.

Areas of Achievement: The Traffic Safety Division scored particularly well in their courteousness and helpfulness to sub-grantees, the accuracy and timeliness of information provided, the fiscal distribution process, and the courteousness and understanding toward sub-grantee problems.

Areas of Improvement: Areas that scored a bit less favorably were the understandability of the grant application process, and the efficiency and timeliness of grant notifications.

Narratives: Complaints from sub-grantees were focused on the criteria for funding and award decisions. Some felt the decisions made regarding the OPO Banquet, additional gas funds, and grant awards were “questionable” and would like more clarification regarding the decision-making process. Responses regarding the work of the Traffic Safety Division staff, and the LEL’s especially, were overwhelmingly positive.

ICJI

Overall agency ratings were quite favorable, which indicates that our sub-grantees are relatively pleased with division performance and grant administration. All divisions appear to be struggling in the understandability, efficiency, notification, and timeliness of the grant application process and award decision-making. However, all divisions scored quite well in the courteousness of staff, as well as the effort and help provided by ICJI employees. A recurring narrative complaint throughout all divisions revolved around the frequent staff changes and the sub-grantees confusion as to who to contact with questions and/or concerns. All divisions, however, were commended on the friendliness and effort of division personnel.